

comprising an antenna, a receiver and a multipath reduction subsystem ... is understood,” and is, therefore, enabling.

In paragraph 5, the examiner says that “the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.” This is the examiner’s opinion, yet, he is obviously not skilled in the art of digital signal processing. He appears not to understand least squares, nor equations ( the language of signal processing) nor does he recognize the significance of the computer code which furnishes a complete example of the method along with results, enabling anyone skilled in the art to put the method into use.

This is not in keeping with MPEP 2164.04 Burden on the Examiner. The examiner must “make specific findings of fact, supported by the evidence, and then draw conclusions based on these findings of fact.” In the case of missing information, “the examiner should specifically identify what information is missing and why one skilled in the art could not supply the information without undue experimentation.”

In paragraph 6, the examiner says that the reference number 17 is used on p. 11 and in the figure to refer to several different types of signal. This is not the case. The number 17 is used for one signal and one signal only: the residual.

In paragraph 6, the examiner says that on p. 11 it says that signal 17 is fed into delayers 11 and frequency shifters 16 which he does not understand. In fact, on p. 10, it says that the residual 17 is fed to a bank of delayers 11 and frequency shifters 16. In fact, from the figure, the residual 17 is fed to one and only one delayer 11.

In paragraph 6, the examiner says on p. 21 it says signal 10 is fed to filters 11, but this is unclear to him from the figure. In fact, on p. 19, it says that 10 is fed into the filter comprised of delays 11. It is clear from the figure that 10 is fed to one and only one delay 11.

A person with ordinary skill in the art of signal processing can read a diagram such as the figure. The examiner is obviously not skilled in the art of signal processing as he is unable to read a simple signal processing diagram. It is understandable that he finds the specification incomprehensible.

In paragraph 8, the examiner rejects the claims “for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.” This is not the case. For claims 1 - 6, the inventions are specifically:

1. A communication system
2. A multipath reduction subsystem
3. A multipath reduction method
4. A surveillance system
5. A surveillance subsystem

6. A surveillance method

In paragraphs 8 and 9, the examiner says that "the specification is incomprehensible" and in paragraph 6, he complains of difficult mathematics. Equations are the language of signal processing. Understanding equations is part of the ordinary skill in the art of signal processing. The examiner appears to be unfamiliar with equations. In recognition of this fact, we have added an explanation of the working of the invention without equations.

Respectfully submitted,

Signed: *Henry Michaels Beisner*

Date: *9/16/2004*

Henry Michaels Beisner, Ph.D., Physics  
11904 Tildenwood Drive  
Rockville, MD 20852